

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **27 February 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-30. The application was objected to because the unacknowledged use of Trademark. Claims 1-8, 11-18 and 21-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Padula (USPN 6,330,486 hereinafter “Padula”). Claims 9-10, 19-20 and 29-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Padula, in view of Gibson (USPN 5,812,688 hereinafter “Gibson”).

Objections

The application was objected to because the unacknowledged use of Trademark.

Applicant has amended paragraphs [0003] and [0004] to overcome this objection. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Independent claims 1, 11, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Padula. Applicant points out that the present invention **uses intercepted parameters** to obtain location information of a display window associated with the application within a three-dimensional display (see paragraph [0037] of the instant application).

Applicant respectfully points out in order to anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must teach every element in the claim. MPEP §2131. Padula does not teach the claim limitations “intercepting parameters associated with audio use from an application.” Specifically, column 1, lines 54-59 of Padula do not teach these limitations either explicitly or implicitly. Furthermore, Padula does not teach the claim limitations “using the intercepted parameters to obtain location information of a display window associated with the application within a three-dimensional display.” Specifically, column 3, lines 9-15 do not teach these

limitations explicitly or implicitly. Thus, Padula does not anticipate the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to clarify that the present invention *uses the intercepted parameters to obtain location information of a display window associated with the application within a three-dimensional display*. These amendments find support in paragraph [0037] of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 21 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-20, which depend upon claim 11, and claims 22-30, which depend upon claim 21, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shun Yao/
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 2 May 2007

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com